

*AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS*

The new sheet presents additional FIG. 13.

No new matter is added to the application by the addition of FIG. 13. FIG. 13 is merely a modification of originally filed FIG. 1 to include the recess that is fully described in paragraph [0033] as originally filed, which stated:

Even greater sealing security can be achieved (although not shown in the drawings) by partially recessing the initially flat sealing disc 26 and the ribs 24 or 25 in a circular recess in the rear wall of the housing 11 around the mounting stem 16 or in the back wall of the cofferdam 2 around the aperture 5.

*REMARKS*

The Office Action and cited reference have been reviewed. No claims have been cancelled or added. Claims 2, 9-11, 13-16 and 18 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found generally within the application and specifically as noted below. Claims 1-20 remain pending. Claims 1 and 3-8 have been allowed. Claims 2 and 10-20 have been objected to. Consideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**Allowed/Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicant would first like to thank the Examiner for confirming the allowable subject matter relating to claims 1-10 and 11-20, as well as the suggestions on how to place the application in better condition for allowance. The following remarks should indicate how the objections relating to mere formalities of the claims and drawings have been overcome. Should the Examiner need any further clarification or corrections, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney and we can discuss the changes to expedite prosecution and disposition of the application.

**Objection to the Drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for failing to include reference sign 35. However, the preliminary amendment June 21, 2006 and filed with the application included a replacement drawing sheet including amended FIG. 8 that includes reference sign 35 identifying a heat sink 35. As such, the drawings comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) and the Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

First, the Examiner identified that the drawings do not include "a plate of thermally conductive metal inside the housing and in thermal contact with the housing" as claimed in claim 4. However, amended FIG. 8 includes heat sink 35, which illustrates this limitation. The specification as filed stated "Heat sink 35 extends from printed circuit board 14 to the outer edge of the housing to conduct heat away from the LEDs. The heat sink may be made from any thermally conductive metal." As such, the drawings clearly include the claim limitation resulting in the objection to the drawings. The Examiner is respectfully solicited to withdraw the rejection to the drawings.

Second, the Examiner identified that the drawings fail to disclose "the boards" as claimed in claim 10. This text has been removed from claim 10 rendering the objection moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

Third, the Examiner identified that the drawings fail to disclose "the base" as claimed in claim 16. The Applicant has submitted a new drawing FIG. 13 which illustrates the recess (52) and that the ribs 24 extend from the base (52) of the recess. The Examiner is requested to approve the accompanying new drawing sheet including FIG. 13. No new matter is added to the application by the addition of FIG. 13. FIG. 13 is merely a modification of originally filed FIG. 1 to include the recess that is fully described in the paragraph [0033] as originally filed, which stated:

Even greater sealing security can be achieved (although not shown in the drawings) **by partially recessing the initially flat sealing disc 26 and the ribs 24 or 25 in a circular recess in the rear wall of the housing 11** around the mounting stem 16 or in the back wall of the cofferdam 2 around the aperture 5.

The Applicant also amended paragraph [0033] to reference new FIG. 13, as identified above in the Amendment to Specification section. Again, new FIG. 13 merely illustrates that which was originally disclosed in the application as filed and no new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully solicited to enter the amendments to the specification and new FIG. 13.

In view of the addition of new FIG. 13, the Examiner is respectfully solicited to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

As such, all of the objections regarding the drawings have been overcome. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to the drawings.

#### **Objection to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claims 2 and 10-20.

The Examiner has objected to claim 2 and its inclusion of "the lighting unit." Claim 2 has been amended to change "the lighting unit" to "the array of light emitting diodes" per the suggestion of the Examiner. As such, the objection to claim 2 should

be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 2.

The Examiner has objected to claim 10 for failing to include a cooperative structure. Claim 10 has been amended to include "in a resin compound" after "board" per the suggestion of the Examiner. As such, the objection to claim 10 should be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 10.

The Examiner has objected to claim 11 and the lack of antecedent basis for "the side wall." Claim 11 has been amended to change "the side wall" to "side wall" per the suggestion of the Examiner. As such, the objection to claim 11 should be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 11.

The Examiner has objected to claim 13 for antecedent basis issues. Claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 12. As such, the antecedent basis issues should be corrected as claim 12 recites "at least one aperture" and "a backwall" per the suggestion of the Examiner. Further, the limitation "or through a hull of the marine vessel" has been removed from claim 13 per the suggestion of the Examiner. As such, the objection to claim 13 should be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 13.

The Examiner has objected to claim 14 and the inclusion of "or stems." The objected to language has been deleted per the suggestion of the Examiner. As such, the objection to claim 14 should be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 14.

The Examiner has objected to claim 15 and the inclusion of "or through a hull of the marine vessel" and "or the hull." Claim 15 has been amended to remove this language per the suggestion of the Examiner.

The Examiner has also objected to claim 15 for the lack of antecedent basis for "the back wall" found in line 4 of claim 15. However, the actual limitation is "the back wall of the cofferdam." Claim 13 provides antecedent basis for this limitation and states:

An underwater lighting unit according to claim 12, wherein the at least one aperture leads to an interior of a hollow tubular mounting stem extending from the back wall of the housing, the mounting stem being externally screw-threaded for mounting the underwater lighting unit through a back wall of a cofferdam of a marine vessel.

As such, the objection to claim 15 should be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 15.

The Examiner has objected to claim 16 for antecedent basis issues regarding the inclusion of "the base." Claim 16 has been amended to recite "a base" rendering the objection to claim 16 moot. As such, the Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 16.

The Examiner has objected to claim 18 and the lack of antecedent basis for "the side wall." Claim 18 has been amended to change "the side wall" to "side wall" per the suggestion of the Examiner. As such, the objection to claim 18 should be rendered moot. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objection and indicate the allowance of claim 18.

Claims 12 and 17 have been objected to for being dependent on objected to claim 11. The objection to claim 11 has been overcome and therefore the objection to claims 12 and 17 should also be overcome. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objections and indicate the allowability of claims 12 and 17.

Claims 19 and 20 have been objected to for being dependent on objected to claim 18. The objection to claim 18 has been overcome and therefore the objection to claims 19 and 20 should also be overcome. The Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the objections and indicate the allowability of claims 19 and 20.

In re Appln. Of: Nigel C. Savage  
Appln. No. 10/583,875

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Mohacsi. Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 1. As claim 1 has been indicated as allowed, claim 9 should be similarly allowed. As such, the Applicant respectfully solicits the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 9 and indicate the allowability thereof.

**Conclusion**

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

**Extension of Time and Fee Deficiency**

Applicants believe that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that Applicants have inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time. If any additional fee is required, or any overpayment is made, in connection with this communication please charge or credit deposit account No. 50-3505.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeremy R. Bridge/  
Jeremy R. Bridge, Reg. No. 61423  
Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren P.C.  
2215 Perrygreen Way  
Rockford, Illinois 61107  
(815) 633-5300 (telephone)  
(815) 654-5770 (facsimile)

Date: February 13, 2008